UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/764,560	12/12/1996	JUN KAKUTA	1083.1027/JD	4899

21171 7590 06/29/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	08/764,560	KAKUTA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 June 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-31* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 06172005

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 6/3/05 for the

application filed on 12/12/96, priority 3/5/96.

2.   Claims 30-31 are added.

3.   Claim 2 is canceled.

4.   Claims 1, 3-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 21, 25, 26, 27 and 28 are

independent claims.

5.   Claim 29 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph since the

claim, as amended, does not clarify the issue raised in the rejection.

Claim Objections

6.   Claim 18 is objected to since the claim appears to be redundant. Its limitations

are already disclosed in claim 17.

7.   Claim 22 is also objected to since the claim appears to be redundant. Its

limitations are already disclosed in claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9.   Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

10.   The claimed limitations while are directed to the transparent window and the

application window, include "returning the selected information object to the original

external application program from which the information object has been obtained"

where the selected object as well as the returning step has no connection to the

transparent window and the application window.

11.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12.   Claim 29 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, it is not clear what position or what

size changes continuously *within* "continuously changing the position or the size when

the position or the size of the window changes."

It is suggested that the phrase "of the transparent window" be inserted into the limitation

as "continuously changing the position or the size *of the transparent window* when the

position or the size of the window changes" instead of being inserted in "wherein the

changing of the position or the size *of the transparent window* comprises ..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15.   Claims 1, 3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (US Pat No. 5,659,791, 8/19/97) in view of

Khoyi et al. (US Pat No. 5,421,015), and Wan (US Pat No. 5,530,795, 6/25/96, filed

2/15/94).

Regarding independent claim 17 and its dependent claim 18, Nakajima discloses:

-       obtaining information from the external application program in accordance with

        the result of the analysis (**col 2, lines 20-43; col 1, lines 46-61:** the scrap object

is integrated into a destination document or transferred between applications via

a clipboard after the information is selected to be extracted from the document)

- creating an information object in accordance with the obtained information and

attribute information which includes object ID, object type and information type

(col 6, lines 25-28: encapsulating of the selected information into an object is

created automatically by the system to encapsulate the selected information in

response to extracting and that is stored in the memory; col 5, lines 64-67, an

object is a combination of data structure that hold *attribute data* and *functions*

that act upon the attribute data; **col 6, lines 64-67:** giving a name for an object

for *referencing the object*, which means each object must have an ID; **col 5,**

lines 55-58: *recognizing of the information type to handle the reintegration of an*

object)

- selecting a created information object (figure 2, step 30, figure 4, step 44)

- returning the contents of the selected information object to the original external

application program from which the information object has been obtained **(col 4,**

lines 51-56, figure 2, step 37, figure 4, step 51: "the desktop sends feedback to

the source object indicating whether the drop was successful and ...After the

scrap object is created, *it may be subsequently integrated into the document,*

including the document from which it originated"; re-integrating the object into the

document where the object information is selected to be dragged, moved or

copied from the document shows said returning step)

It is noted that the "analyzing an event ...." step is inherently included in Nakajima since the obtaining step is performed in accordance with the result of the analysis. Nakajima does not disclose the priority for showing of objects, time stamp, object link which are able to be modified after being created as an information object. Nakajima also does not disclose showing the information object such that the information object appears different from any non-selected information in the external program.

Khoyi discloses:

- the object catalog including the object table and link table (figure 5)

- the object table includes object identifiers, object type and object location (figure 6)

- the link table includes link ID, link type, parent object identifiers, child object identifiers (figure 7)

- the linking of data objects (col 3, lines 12-20; col 43, lines 1-11)

- the ability of editing of the moved or copied objects (col 43, lines 66-67; col 44, lines 1-5)

- the changing the manner of drawing the information object on the basis of the attribute information (col 3, lines 22-36)

- *a new object is created at will by a user by modifying the object prototype in the object* prototype *table to change the characteristics of the object (col 3, lines 37-48, when the characteristics of an object is changed, the appearance of the object should be changed. In other words, the appearance of the selected object is different from the non-selected object)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Khoyi into Nakajima to have the information objects, for user selecting of information, which include object ID, object type, object link and the ability of modifying objects after created. As disclosed, the attribute information includes object ID, object type and object link, parent object ID and child object ID which are object ID of next object, thus motivating the including of the priority for showing objects and time stamp, which are other information data related to the object.

In addition, the fact that Nakajima shows that the information is selected as requested, transferred and integrated into a document of another application implies that the system can analyze an event for selecting information as well as creating an information object as desired.

In addition, Nakajima and Khoyi do not disclose *a transparent window* through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen, said transparent window having a position and size being the same position and a same size as the application window, and wherein the position or the size of said window changes, said transparent window will automatically be changed to have the same position and size as that of said window.

Wan discloses a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen, said transparent window having a position and size being the same position and a same size as the application window, and wherein the position or the size of said window changes, said transparent window will automatically be changed to have the same position and size as that of said window

(**col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24**: *the fact that the transparent window when automatically moving* and resizing can <u>cover exactly the application window</u> implies that the positions and the sizes of the two windows are the same so that one can cover <u>exactly</u> the other; the fact that the transparent window moves and resizes to cover exactly the application window implies that some change is made to the application window so that the transparent window <u>needs resizing to adjust</u> the position and the size with the application window; also, it was well known that the application window underlying the transparent window must be seen through the transparent window due to the transparency feature).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Wan into Nakajima and Khoyi to conveniently present, view and edit information that a user can easily see through a window and manipulate the underlying data via a transparence mechanism.

Claim 21 is for a computer readable program code to perform the steps in claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 3 is the system for performing the step in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 is the program code means for performing the step in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 1, Nakajima discloses, as in claim 17:

- storing contents and attribute information of an information object to be shown,

  the attribute information being concerned with showing the information object and

  including object ID, object type, information type (col 6, lines 25-28, the selected

  information is created automatically by the system in response to extracting and

  these objects are stored in the memory; col 5, lines 64-67, an object is a

  combination of data structure that hold attribute data and functions that act upon

  the attribute data; col 6, lines 64-67, giving a name for an object for referencing

  the object which means each object must have an ID; col 5, lines 55-58,

  recognizing of the information type to handle the reintegration of an object)

- drawing information object on said transparent window in accordance with the

  content and attribute information relating to the display of the object stored in

  said information storing unit, and changing a manner of drawing the information

  object on the basis of the attribute information (col 3, lines 37-48, modifying

  objects by changing the objects' characteristics)

- performing at least any one of processes including a process of controlling said

  information storing unit, a process of controlling said message transmitting unit

  and a process of controlling said drawing unit, in accordance with the result of

  the analysis reported from said event analyzing unit (col 2, lines 20-43; col 1,

  lines 46-61; col 3, lines 25-35; the information is selected, transferred and

  integrated into another document using a scrap object as a vehicle for

  interapplication transfer of information)

-   transmitting a control message to an external application program in order to get a selected information in the external application program (col 2, lines 20-43; col 1, lines 46-61; col 3, lines 25-35; transmitting messages is inherently included in the performing step, otherwise information selection, transferring, or integrating can not be performed)

-   analyzing all the events from an operation system and reporting a result of the analysis (col 2, lines 55-60, operating system provides code for a clipboard and code for implementing a user interface; col 3, lines 25-40, role of the mouse and the operating system in the drag-and-drop mechanism used to create a scrap object in which the movement of the mouse, the depression and the release of the mouse button, each constitutes an event that is translated by the operating system into a message, and the operating system post most of the mouse messages into a message queue for a currently executing application program; reporting a result of the analysis is inherently included in the performed step since the performing step is carried out in accordance with the result of the analysis)

-   selecting a created information object (figure 2, step 30, figure 4, step 44)

-   returning the contents of the selected information object to the original external application program from which the information object has been obtained (col 4, lines 51-56, figure 2, step 37, figure 4, step 51: "the desktop sends feedback to the source object indicating whether the drop was successful and ...After the scrap object is created, *it may be subsequently integrated into the document,*

including the document from which it originated"; re-integrating the object into the

document where the object information is selected to be dragged, moved or

copied from the document shows said returning step)

Nakajima does not disclose the priority for showing of objects, time stamp, object link

which are able to be modified after being created as an information object. Nakajima

also does not disclose showing the information object such that the information object

appears different from any non-selected information in the external program.

Khoyi discloses:

-    the object catalog including the object table and link table (figure 5)

-    the object table includes object identifiers, object type and object location (figure

     6)

-    the link table includes link ID, link type, parent object identifiers, child object

     identifiers (figure 7)

-    the linking of data objects (col 3, lines 12-20; col 43, lines 1-11)

-    the ability of editing of the moved or copied objects (col 43, lines 66-67; col 44,

     lines 1-5)

-    the changing the manner of drawing the information object on the basis of the

     attribute information (col 3, lines 22-36)

-    _a new object is created at will by a user by modifying the object prototype in the_

     object prototype _table to change the characteristics of the object (col 3, lines 37-_

     48, when the characteristics of an object is changed, the appearance of the

>*object should be changed. In other words, the appearance of the selected object*
>
>*is different from the non-selected object)*

In addition, Nakajima and Khoyi do not disclose *a transparent window* through which

contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen, said

transparent window having a position and size being the same position and a same size

as the application window, and wherein the position or the size of said window changes,

said transparent window will automatically be changed to have the same position and

size as that of said window.

Wan discloses a transparent window through which contents of the information

controlled by the external application program is seen, said transparent window having

a position and size being the same position and a same size as the application window,

and wherein the position or the size of said window changes, said transparent window

will automatically be changed to have the same position and size as that of said window

(**col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24**: *the fact that the transparent window when automatically*

moving and resizing can <u>cover exactly the application window</u> implies that the positions

and the sizes of the two windows are the same so that one can cover <u>exactly</u> the other;

the fact that the transparent window moves and resizes to cover exactly the application

window implies that some change is made to the application window so that the

transparent window <u>needs resizing to adjust</u> the position and the size with the

application window; also, it was well known that the application window underlying the

transparent window must be seen through the transparent window due to the

transparency feature).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Wan into Nakajima and Khoyi to conveniently present, view and edit information that a user can easily see through a window and manipulate the underlying data via a transparence mechanism.

Independent claim 25 includes part of limitations of claims 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 26 is for the computer-readable program code for the method claim 25, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 27 includes limitations disclosed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

16.   Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi, and Wan as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Person (*Using Windows 3.1*, 1993).

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima, Khoyi, and Wan do not disclose the editing of the contents of the selected information objects after created. Person discloses the editing the contents of the embedded objects in a document (p.235, 236, 521, 522).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Person to Nakajima because Nakajama shows the transferring selected information objects and Person shows the editing the selected information objected after created.

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima shows the <u>combining</u> <u>objects</u> when a scrap object integrated into another object of other document. Nakajima also discloses the class object that refers to a <u>group of objects</u> thus all scrap objects belong to the scrap object class have the same type of attributes and functions (col 3, lines 1-12). Nakajima does not show the editing process including moving objects, deleting objects, changing objects and creating objects.
However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have included moving, deleting, changing and creating objects since it was well known that a user can (a) move an object from one location to another by using the drag-and-drop mechanism, (b) delete an object by highlighting the object and pressing the delete key, (c) change an object by highlighting a portion of the object and pressing the delete key to remove that portion, (d) to create a new information object by selecting a portion of an object and save It under a different name.

Claim 23 is a computer program code means to perform the functions of claim 19, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is a computer program code means to perform the functions of claim 20, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 4-10 are for the means included in the system to perform the functions disclosed in claim 20, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima, Khoyi, and Wan do not disclose that when a selected text or graphics is moved, the rest of the document is moved to maintain the relative location in the document.
However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated that feature into Nakajima, Khoyi, and Wan since it was well known in the art when a selected text or graphics is moved, the rest of the document is moved to maintain the relative location in the document.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, the fact that a file subdirectory containing a plurality of files including the index file, if the index files is selected and deleted, the whole subdirectory is deleted, can be applied to the object group as claimed.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima does not disclose that an information object belonging to any one of information object groups and an information object which does not belong to any information object group are shown on

the window by different ways. Person discloses the document including the information selected from different applications. The display of the whole document is different from the display of only the information from Microsoft Excel which is the graph and the table (page 208). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Person into Nakajima because Person shows the display of the combined document, including text and graphics, which is different from the document from Excel which includes only the graph and table.

17.   Claims 13-15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi, Wan, and Person as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Microsoft (*Microsoft Windows User's Guide*, 1992).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima, Khoy, Wand and Person do not disclose the relationship of the selected information object in the information object group is canceled when one information object in the information object group is selected.

 Microsoft discloses that when deleting a link from an Cardfile object embedded in a Write document, both the link to the drawing and the drawing are removed from the document (p. 502).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Microsoft into Nakajima, Khoy, Frank, Wand and Person since the fact that the *removing* of the link to the drawing and the drawing when deleting a link from an object embedded in the document suggests selecting the object before

deleting and canceling the relationship of the object and other objects embedded in the document.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Nakajima, Khoyi, Person and Microsoft do not disclose that when the two objects are selected and the hierarchical relationship is given to the selected information objects to form the information object group, and when one of them is deleted, the other is removed, too.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified to include in Nakajima, Khoyi, Person and Microsoft said forming the information object group based on the selected objects and their given hierarchical relationship and said deleting feature since it was well known that if two selected objects has a hierarchical relationship, when one is deleted, the other is removed, too due to the inheritance.

18.   Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan (US Pat No. 5,530,795, 6/25/96, filed 2/15/94) in view of Nakajima et al. (US Pat No. 5,659,791, 8/19/97).

Regarding independent claim 28, Wan discloses:

- displaying, on a window displaying information controlled by the external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program are seen (**col 2, line**

66 to col 3, line 24: covering the contents of the information in a window by a

transparent window shows the claimed displaying)

- detecting a position and a size of the window (**col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24**:

moving and resizing the transparent window *to cover* the application window

exactly inherently shows that the position and the size of the window are

detected so that covering the application window can be performed exactly

based on the size and position of the application window)

- positioning and sizing the transparent window to have a same position and size

as the detected position and size of the window (**col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24**:

covering the application window exactly by the transparent window shows that

the two windows have the same position and sizes)

- changing the position or the size of the transparent window to be the same as the

position and size of the window when the position or the size of the window

changes (**col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24: moving** the transparent window **to**

cover the application window **exactly** shows changing the position of the

transparent window to be the same as the position of the window when said

position changes, and **resizing** the transparent window **to cover** the application

window **exactly** shows changing the size of the transparent window to be the

same as the size of the window when said size changes)

Wan does not disclose:

- selecting a created information object

- returning the contents of the selected information object to the original external

    application program from which the information object has been obtained

Nakajima discloses:

- selecting a created information object (figure 2, step 30, figure 4, step 44)

- returning the contents of the selected information object to the original external

    application program from which the information object has been obtained (col 4,

    lines 51-56, figure 2, step 37, figure 4, step 51: "the desktop sends feedback to

    the source object indicating whether the drop was successful and ...After the

    scrap object is created, *it may be subsequently integrated into the document,*

    including the document from which it originated"; re-integrating the object into the

    document where the object information is selected to be dragged, moved or

    copied from the document shows said returning step)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have combined Nakajima into Wan since Nakajima discloses returning the

selected object to the original document providing the advantage to incorporate into

Wan for returning the selected object to the original application from which said object is

selected via the transparent window.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Wan disclose continuously

changing the position or the size when the position or the size of the window changes

 (col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24: since Wan discloses *automatically changing* the size

and the position of the transparent window *so that it covers exactly the application*

window when the size and the position of the window is changed, Wan implies that

whenever the size and the position of the window is changed, the size and the position

of the transparent window will _continuously change_ for performing the covering feature).

Response to Arguments

19.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/3/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicants argue that the claimed returning is not taught in Nakajima since integrating

the scrap object into the document, including the document from which it originated

does not show that the changed contents are inserted (Remarks, page 15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. .

Re-integrating an object to the document from which it originated shows the returning of

said object to its original document. The fact that whether the content is changed when

being inserted does not matter since the selected object, as claimed, when being

returned is not a changed object.

Applicants argue that Wan does not disclose that the transparent window continuously

changes whenever the size of the window changes since there is no further change in

the position/size of the transparent window after the time of copying (Remarks, page

15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Since Wan discloses *automatically changing* the size and the position of the transparent

window *so that it covers exactly the application window* when the size and the position

of the window is changed (**col 2, line 66 to col 3, line 24**), Wan implies that *whenever*

the size and the position of the window is changed, the size and the position of the

transparent window will *continuously change* for performing the covering feature.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Brooks (US Pat No. 6,008,809, 12/28/99, 9/22/97).

DeStefano (US Pat No. 6,654,035 B1, 11/25/03, filed 3/28/00, priority 12/15/97).

Rodden et al. (US Pat No. 6,473,102 B1, 10/29/02, filed 5/11/99).

Gutekunst et al., A Distributed and Policy-Free General-Purpose Shared Window

System, IEEE 1995, pages 51-62.

21.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-

4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
06/17/05